DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 887 PS 029 112


AUTHOR Blum, Barbara B.; Farnsworth, Jennifer; Lennon, Mary Clare; Winn, Ellen


TITLE Welfare Research Perspectives: Past, Present, and Future. A View from the Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism. 2000 Edition.


INSTITUTION National Center for Children in Poverty, New York, NY.



SPONS AGENCY Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Chase Manhattan Foundations, New York, NY.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Inst. for Research on Poverty.; George Gund Foundation, Cleveland, OH.

PUB DATE 2000-08-00

NOTE 21p.; For 1999 working paper, see ED 435 484.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Children; *Family (Sociological Unit); *Federal Legislation; Research Methodology; *Research Needs; Research Problems; *Welfare Recipients

IDENTIFIERS *Personal Responsibility and Work Opp Recon Act; *Welfare Reform



ABSTRACT

Research continues to provide valuable information about the effects of welfare changes on families receiving public assistance. This working paper is the second in a series of three examining what has been learned since the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996. Following an introduction outlining the requirements of the PRWORA, the paper delineates questions salient to the issue of reauthorization of the Act related to state spending/supplantation (substituting federal funds for state funds), caseload dynamics, employment, income, family composition, special populations, ameliorating negative effects through interventions, and the effects of a serious recession. The paper further presents highlights of previous and current research findings pertinent to the objectives of PRWORA and identifies needed research areas. The research methodology issues still requiring action are described, including promoting well-designed, rigorous research; disseminating information from conferences and meetings; synthesizing findings; enhancing current research activities; examining specific populations; and testing special interventions. The paper concludes by noting that although an impressive portfolio of research findings is available to sustain positive trends and ameliorate problems related to PRWORA, an ambitious research agenda remains to address further unanswered questions. The paper's appendix lists reviewed and unreviewed projects in the Research Forum Database, with publication contact information. (KB)



Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 448 887

*A View from the*

RESEARCH FORUM ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES, AND THE NEW FEDERALISM

# Welfare Research Perspectives

## Past, Present, and Future

### *2000 Edition*

Barbara B. Blum
Jennifer Farnsworth
Mary Clare Lennon
Ellen Winn

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PS 029112

NATIONAL CENTER
FOR CHILDREN IN POVERTY
Mailman School of Public Health
Columbia University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN
MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Siecke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

## Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism

The Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism, an initiative of the National Center for Children in Poverty, was founded in January 1997, and is supported by the Annie E. Casey, Chase Manhattan, Edna McConnell Clark, George Gund, and David and Lucile Packard Foundations and also by the Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Research Forum is committed to encouraging rigorous study of issues and interventions affecting poor families; to promoting collaborative work among and between researchers, policymakers, and practitioners; and to facilitating access to information that can inform policy and practice.


Research Forum Advisors

J. Lawrence Aber *National Center for Children in Poverty*
Thomas Corbett *Institute for Research on Poverty*
Susan Mayer *Joint Center for Poverty Research*
Deborah Phillips *Board on Children, Youth, and Families*
Howard Rolston *Administration for Children and Families, DHHS*
Patricia Ruggles *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Ann Segal *Office of Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, DHHS*
Barry L. Van Lare *Welfare Information Network*

Research Forum Staff

Barbara B. Blum *Director*
Mary Clare Lennon *Director of Research*
Brenda Hureau *Administrative Assistant*
Jennifer Farnsworth *Graduate Research Assistant*
Carole J. Oshinsky *Managing Editor, National Center for Children in Poverty*





Copyright © August 2000 by the National Center for Children in Poverty

# Introduction

This is the second in a series of three working papers designed to examine what has been learned since the enactment of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, which is effective until fiscal year 2002. PRWORA ended Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), the federal entitlement to assistance for eligible needy families with children, and created the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant (TANF). The goals of TANF are to: (1) provide support to poor families so that children may be cared for in their own homes or in the homes of relatives; (2) promote job preparation, work, and marriage in order to reduce families' receipt of government benefits; (3) prevent and reduce the incidence of nonmarital pregnancies; and (4) encourage the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. Under the new law, states are allowed greater flexibility over the design and implementation of their welfare programs, but are required to impose work requirements and enforce a 5-year limit on the receipt of federal assistance. PRWORA makes $16.8 billion available to states each year through 2002 to help them achieve TANF goals.

As the first working paper published in August 1999 indicated, welfare policies in the United States have changed profoundly since the passage of PRWORA. Foremost among the changes is the dramatic and continuing reduction in the number of individuals participating in the TANF program. In 1999, nearly 2.5 million families were receiving cash assistance from TANF, a reduction of 51 percent from the caseload of five million families receiving AFDC in 1994. Changes in caseload come from movement into the workforce, departures due to sanctions or time limits, and reduced entries that reflect diversion programs as well as participants' reluctance to conform to TANF mandates, particularly the work requirements. Starting in the mid 1990s, a strong economy and new state waiver programs had already stimulated declining enrollment in AFDC. PRWORA's requirements, plus continued economic strength, are sustaining these earlier trends.

Caseload reductions of somewhat lesser magnitude have been experienced in the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs since PRWORA's implementation. TANF participants and many TANF "leavers"—those individuals who have left or been diverted from the program—are still eligible for these benefits. However, participation in both the Medicaid and Food Stamp programs has been reduced, largely due to changes in immigrant eligibility under TANF. In addition, there have been problems administering TANF, and many individuals are not informed that they can apply for these benefits regardless of their TANF status. While PRWORA legislation is responsible for many effects, other changes in immigration law, Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits, and health programs continue to affect TANF recipients and low-income working families.

TANF, Medicaid, and Food Stamp reductions have produced substantial fiscal surpluses for most states, providing an opportunity to budget resources for new initiatives that can further advance the objectives of PRWORA. Of the $40.4 billion available in total funds from 1997 to 1999, only $2.2 billion remained unobligated. Although some states are using federal funds to create new kinds of programs and others are saving them for use in a recession, many have still not made substantial changes to their welfare programs.

In a period when most states are collecting greatly increased revenue from income and other taxes, fiscal adjustments to ensure that TANF revenues have been properly applied are critical to sustaining levels of funding that will allow states to advance the goals of welfare reform. TANF funds present an unprecedented opportunity for program development and the creation of interventions for the most vulnerable participants. Researchers should be monitoring states' use of these funds carefully.

## PRWORA Reauthorization—What We Need to Know

The fact that PRWORA must be reauthorized by 2002 makes it important to inventory what has been learned from past and current research and what information has yet to be developed. A conference on welfare program evaluation sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in June 2000 catalogued salient questions related to reauthorization. These questions pertain to:

**State spending/supplantation**

- States uses of TANF surpluses
- States substituting federal funds for state funds – 'supplanting' the state funds

**Caseload dynamics**

- Caseload numbers by state
- Reentry rates by state
- Effects of sanctions
- Effects of time limits
- Those left on the rolls
- Changes in Food Stamps and Medicaid programs

**Employment**

- Information on numbers of TANF recipients employed
- Hours and duration of work
- Retention rates
- Evidence of advancement in the workforce

**Income**

- Earnings
- Information on shared household income

**Family composition**

- Marriage rates and trends
- Family size
- Birthrates by age cohort and marital status

**Special populations**

- Adults not on the rolls and not working
- Adults who are working
- Children
- Floundering families (some likely on the rolls and some likely neither employed nor receiving assistance)
- Fathers
- Immigrants
- Native Americans
- Rural participants
- Urban participants

**Ameliorating negative effects through interventions**

- Training interventions
- Child care interventions
- Special programs for vulnerable populations (particularly for victims of domestic violence)

**The effects of a serious recession**

It is striking to note how many data sources and how many different research methods are needed to adequately answer these questions. Fortunately, much of the information already exists in administrative data files or in surveys completed or underway. Federal and state policymakers need to contemplate the extensive sets of existing and forthcoming findings to improve outcomes for TANF participants and leavers.

## Highlights of Research Findings: 1970s to Early 1990s

As indicated in the 1999 edition of this Research Forum publication, highly relevant research began to emerge in the late 1970s and throughout the 1980s. Research findings most pertinent to PRWORA's objectives include:

- Research and analytic studies during the 1980s indicating that: (1) modest investments led to modest improvements in employment, earnings, and reduced reliance on public assistance and (2) caseload dynamics were related to levels of education and employment experience. This research identified a cohort of individuals (about 50 percent of the caseload) who moved into the workforce in a relatively short time.

- Three controlled experiments—New Chance Demonstration, Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD), and Learning, Earning, and Parenting (LEAP) programs—illustrated the difficulties of improving education, employment, income, and childbearing outcomes for young mothers.

- Carefully designed studies that track children whose parents were participants in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program (now the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies) and in the New Chance Demonstration revealed the severity and prevalence of physical and developmental problems for children of teenage and other welfare mothers. These findings substantiated earlier analyses by Child Trends, which detailed the problems of poor children, particularly those in low-income working families.

- More recent research from the waiver studies of the early 1990s documents increases in employment and reductions in caseloads at sites where time limits and sanctions were imposed, although the administration of and the rationale propelling time limits and sanctions are often problematic for staff and welfare participants. These findings on time limits are reinforced by the first policy brief from Welfare, Children, and Families: A Three-City Study, *What Welfare Recipients Know About the New Rules and What They Have to Say About Them* (July 2000), which highlights the variations from place to place and the complexities of understanding the application of time limits.

## Recent and Emerging Research Findings

Studies undertaken since PRWORA's implementation are also beginning to yield important information that will help shape future welfare policy.

- The effects of financial incentives when work is mandated are very impressive. Findings from the Minnesota Family Investment Program (MFIP) and the Canada Self-Sufficiency Program (SSP), supported by earlier New Hope and New York Child Assistance Program (NY CAP) findings, demonstrate that it is possible to improve employment and earnings while reducing poverty. The ambiguous findings of the National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies (NEWWS), which was not so enriched in financial incentives, make the effect of financial incentives even more credible.

- "Leaver" studies, with their consistent theme of entry into low-wage jobs, emphasize the importance of increasing financial incentives. These studies also signal the need to address job retention and learn more about sanctioned populations.

- It is expected that two particular research initiatives, the Project on Devolution and Urban Change and Welfare, Children, and Families: A Three-City Study, will reveal even more interesting perspectives based on very rich sets of information derived from surveys, administrative data, and ethnographic studies. These emerging findings need to be factored into welfare policy debates.

- The welfare-to-work experiments and the Employment Retention and Advancement (ERA) initiatives will be producing important information on impacts from interventions designed to improve employment, retention, and advancement in the work place. In the near term, information from the implementation phase of NEWWS

should help inform our understanding about what vulnerable families need. Similarly, the theoretical framework developed for ERA can mold policies concerned with retention and advancement.

- With regard to special populations, there are studies underway on Native Americans and rural and urban populations that need to be mined for emerging policy directions.

- A body of knowledge about child well-being is beginning to develop that should be very useful. MFIP and New Hope are particularly important for this. Contrasting this information with NEWSS' impacts for children should be used to encourage well designed, generous interventions. Other child outcome studies will publish findings over the next several years, providing more opportunities for cross-site comparisons. In addition, child welfare waiver studies and national studies of child care (such as the National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families) will offer information on two vitally important programs serving children from low-income families—child welfare and child care subsidy programs.

## Questions Still Unanswered

Despite the multitude of studies, some key areas remain to be addressed.

- Many of the questions related to caseload dynamics, employment, and earnings can and should be studied using and sometimes matching administrative data sets. States will want to work collaboratively with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to provide consistently structured information to inform policymakers.

- Information about participants remaining on the rolls and about persons sanctioned or diverted requires more in-depth research and should have very high priority. Fortunately, the Rockefeller Institute is fielding an extensive survey to study these populations, and the Assessing the New Federalism project continues to analyze data pertaining to these groups as well.

- Research continues to be needed to examine the impact of PRWORA and other statutory changes on immigrant families. In particular, studies focused on the degree to which the reduction in welfare, Medicaid, and Food Stamps caseloads reflects diminishing benefits for immigrants, especially immigrant children, would help lawmakers formulate ameliorative policies.

- While research is beginning to show that child poverty *can* be reduced with financial incentives, more child outcome studies that target Latino and African-American children, children whose families live in urban and rural areas, and children in immigrant families are critically important.

- Further research should be focused on: (1) effective interventions for those TANF participants who do not enter employment, (2) studies of those affected by sanctions, and (3) those who are long-term "stayers." These studies are likely to reveal particular circumstances and disabilities—including domestic violence, depression, developmental disabilities, and/or drug use—for specific TANF populations. Conditions such as these may respond to carefully designed interventions, which require testing. Initiatives at the University of Michigan, at Mathematica Policy Research, and at the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) promise to address many of these problems. More such initiatives are needed.

## Research Methodology Issues

In addition to expanding the topical areas for research studies, a number of research methodology issues still require action. These include:

1. **Promoting well-designed, rigorous research**

   While research activities continue to produce a wealth of information, the quality of the studies still varies considerably. Issues related to design, scale, sample size, participation and response rates, attrition, and implementation all continue to affect the validity of each study's findings. Thus, it remains exceedingly important to showcase the research that will produce the most reliable findings and to promote sound implementation and quasi-experimental endeavors.

2. **Disseminating information from conferences and meetings**

   There continue to be many forums where respected researchers provide important presentations. In the past year, government and nongovernment organizations such as the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Institute for Research on Poverty (IRP) at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, the Joint Center for Poverty Research (JCPR) at Northwestern University/University of Chicago, the National Research Council, the Welfare Reform Academy, The Urban Institute, and The Brookings Institution have hosted multiple meetings on income security research. In addition, the Annie E. Casey Foundation continues to support monthly briefings for congressional staff. While some progress has occurred in sharing information, these and similar presentations still require more systematic summarization, so that pertinent information reaches larger audiences of researchers, policymakers, program personnel, and the media.

3. **Synthesizing findings**

   Simultaneous studies have been measuring the effects of particular program components like time limits, financial incentives, sanctions, and school attendance requirements. Others have been analyzing the impacts of different TANF programs on specific populations, such as children and welfare leavers.

In the past year, several important syntheses have been published or are proposed to be published. They include cross-study analyses of time limits, fiscal incentives, and child outcomes. In addition, in every state, multiple research projects continue to examine aspects of income security programs and policies. As an example, in the state of Illinois researchers are working collaboratively with JCPR and the Welfare Information Network (WIN) to share information about methods and outcomes. Synthesizing findings from these various sets of state studies should be a research priority.

4. Enhancing current research activities

Analytic and implementation studies require continued support in order to improve their representativeness and sample size, extend the duration of the study inquiry, and generally enhance research design. Expanding initiatives to improve the quality and use of administrative data are of particular importance during the period preceding PRWORA reauthorization. Especially heartening is the collaborative work of scholars concerned with improving implementation studies. This initiative has been supported by IRP and the Research Forum.

5. Examining specific populations

Many questions about the effects of TANF on adults and their children continue to remain unanswered. More information is still needed about the status of families who earn low wages or who have left public assistance without obtaining employment. Researchers need increasingly to study how high-risk families, in which the parent(s) may be depressed, developmentally disabled, or drug addicted, are faring.

Findings from NEWWS and the University of Michigan studies, as well as others, highlight the prevalence of mental health problems and other disabilities among TANF recipients that need to be addressed. Studies also need to examine the well-being of immigrant families, families from diverse racial and ethnic groups, urban and rural families, families with domestic abuse, as well as welfare cases in which the child and not the parent is eligible for TANF.

6. Testing special interventions

Based on what is being learned about specific populations, programs need to be developed and experimentally tested in order to identify effective interventions for salient problems. For poor working families, some combination of federal and state earned income tax credits (EITC), access to Food Stamps and Medicaid, and provision of quality child care, transportation, and housing assistance may increase stability and decrease the likelihood of recidivism that many of these families experience. The Earnfare experiment in New York City has been designed to test these assumptions. In addition, a project being developed by Mathematica Policy Research and funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services is designed to improve utilization of Medicaid and Food Stamps.

For more troubled and dysfunctional families, a combination of well-designed, supported work programs, and enhanced, Head Start-like child care may succeed in reducing TANF enrollment and promoting child well-being. A point has now been reached in PRWORA's implementation when testing such initiatives is timely. It is

encouraging that collaborative work at the University of Michigan with MDRC promises to test this second set of assumptions.

## Conclusion

Since the passage of PRWORA, social welfare policies in this nation have been profoundly changed. Extraordinary numbers of individuals who were formerly dependent on public assistance—sometimes for long periods of time—have moved into the workforce. Positive economic trends, low unemployment rates, decreases in teen pregnancy rates and in divorce rates all continue to support the goals of the 1996 statute. An impressive portfolio of research findings with many relevant lessons is now available to sustain positive trends and ameliorate problems related to PRWORA.

Yet, while many more individuals who were previously dependent on public assistance are working, most are receiving very low wages and are sometimes worse off. Fortunately, research findings suggest that strategies which mandate work while providing financial incentives can improve earnings, employment, and child outcomes while reducing poverty. These are exceptionally important findings that should influence the reauthorization process.

However, there remains a dearth of information about persons who have been sanctioned and about persons remaining on the rolls. Clearly, carefully crafted surveys of these two (inter-related) populations should have highest priority. Understanding the degree to which sanctioned and long-term participants are developmentally disabled, severely depressed, addicted to drugs, or otherwise disabled is needed to inform the reauthorization process.

Similarly, child outcomes remain a primary concern. The NEWWS findings highlight the vulnerability of welfare-dependent children. At the same time, MFIP, CSSP, and New Hope provide evidence that a range of strategies exist to positively change outcomes for large numbers of vulnerable children.

Immigrant impacts are also not adequately understood. Since one in ten children live in immigrant households, much more attention to immigrant families is warranted.

In addition, for the most vulnerable groups, an increased number of carefully designed interventions are required.

Altogether, an ambitious research agenda remains, but one well worth addressing. Based on the knowledge that has developed in the past decade, such an agenda is feasible.

APPENDIX

# Monitoring and Supporting Welfare Research

## Background

Information for this working paper is drawn from an interactive web-based database (www.researchforum.org) created by staff at the Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism that became operational in October 1997.

In the database, larger, multi-site studies that meet pre-established criteria and whose summary descriptions have been reviewed by a principal investigator are categorized as *reviewed* projects. Smaller, single site projects are categorized as *unreviewed*. Icons are used to indicate an income security focus, a family/child focus, or a joint focus. In addition, a set of studies (both reviewed and unreviewed) are categorized as policy analysis projects.

## Volume and Distribution of TANF Research Projects

The geographical distribution of active research projects in the Research Forum database roughly correlates with TANF caseloads (see Figure 1). Of the projects in the database in July 2000, 46 include California as a study site. Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, and Texas also have a high volume of research activity. Fewer research projects are being conducted in states that are smaller or have fewer TANF recipients. For instance, there are only 11 welfare reform studies in Rhode Island, Idaho, or New Hampshire.

Of the 177 projects in the database, 147 study issues related to income security; 25 of these projects include analyses of child and family effects. Final findings exist for 48 of these evaluations; 59 have interim findings; 40 have no findings yet.

A subset of evaluations (some of which are embedded within income security evaluations) is focused on child and family outcomes. Eleven of these evaluations have final findings; 17 have interim findings; 31 have no findings yet.

The database includes 38 policy studies; 16 have been completed and 22 are on-going.

The "Key Topics" section of the Research Forum's web site (www.researchforum.org/cfm/keytopics.cfm) contains income security studies that address the effects of time limits, sanctions, and work requirements, and the impacts of financial incentives, welfare-to-work strategies, and job retention strategies. This section also contains child and family research studies that measure child outcomes related to state welfare programs and others focused on child care, child welfare, and child support issues.

## Federally Sponsored Research on Specific Groups

In the last two years, several federal agencies launched research projects to measure the effects of welfare reform on different populations. These projects were designed to complement existing studies and further enhance the knowledge base. The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE), U. S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), are responsible for coordinating the implementation of PRWORA. These agencies initiated a series of studies that are clustered around specific topics and populations relevant to welfare reform. To facilitate comparisons of findings across sites, the projects attempt to employ similar research questions and data collection methods. The U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Department of Labor (DOL), and Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and other federal agencies have also been engaged in research activities. Funding for many of the projects is drawn from the $5 million provided by Congress in 1998 to study welfare reform. States, localities, and private foundations are providing additional resources for these studies, as well. Figure 2 shows the federally funded sites and studies.

The "Key Topics" section of the Research Forum's web site (www.researchforum.org/cfm/keytopics.cfm) contains a number of the federal studies that focus on populations of special interest. They include studies of TANF and Food Stamp leavers, immigrants, rural populations, and tribal groups. This section also contains information about special initiatives on transportation and housing—two critically important elements for welfare-to-work and employment retention programs.

## Research Forum Web Site Projects

The Research Forum's web-based database contains descriptions of the 177 projects that are listed at the end of this report; 47 are reviewed and 130 are unreviewed.

## Publications

The projects listed above have produced 532 publications in the last several years; 134 of them since August 1999, when the first Research Forum working paper was published.

An additional 51 reports are projected to be published for the coming year. In most instances, these published reports can be downloaded from the web site of the sponsoring organization or by contacting the organization via e-mail.

## Figure 1: Projects in Research Forum Database as of July 2000

| | Reviewed | Unreviewed | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| ALABAMA | •••••• | ••••••★ | 12 |
| ALASKA | ••• | ••••••★ | 9 |
| ARIZONA | •••••••★ | •••••••••★ | 16 |
| ARKANSAS | ••••••••★ | •••••••••★ | 17 |
| CALIFORNIA | ••••••••••••••••••••★ | ••••••••••••••••••••★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★ | 46 |
| COLORADO | •••••••★ | •••••••••★★ | 16 |
| CONNECTICUT | ••••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 16 |
| DELAWARE | •••••★ | •••••••★ | 12 |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | ••• | ••••••••★ | 11 |
| FLORIDA | ••••••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 21 |
| GEORGIA | •••••••• | ••••••••••★ | 17 |
| HAWAII | •••• | ••••••★ | 10 |
| IDAHO | •••• | ••••••★ | 10 |
| ILLINOIS | •••••••••••• | ••••••••••••••★ | 26 |
| INDIANA | ••••••• | •••••••★ | 13 |
| IOWA | •••••••••★ | •••••••••★ | 18 |
| KANSAS | •••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 15 |
| KENTUCKY | ••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 14 |
| LOUISIANA | ••••• | ••••••••★ | 13 |
| MAINE | •••• | •••••••★ | 11 |
| MARYLAND | •••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 20 |
| MASSACHUSETTS | ••••••••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 26 |
| MICHIGAN | ••••••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 24 |
| MINNESOTA | ••••••••• | •••••••★ | 15 |
| MISSISSIPPI | ••••• | ••••••••★ | 13 |
| MISSOURI | •••• | •••••••••★ | 13 |
| MONTANA | •••• | ••••••★ | 10 |
| NEBRASKA | •••• | •••••••★ | 11 |
| NEVADA | ••••• | •••••••★ | 12 |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | •••• | •••••••★ | 11 |
| NEW JERSEY | ••••••••• | ••••••••★ | 16 |
| NEW MEXICO | •••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 16 |
| NEW YORK | ••••••••••••★ | ••••••••••••••★ | 30 |
| NORTH CAROLINA | •••••••★ | •••••••••★ | 16 |
| NORTH DAKOTA | ••••• | ••••••★ | 11 |
| OHIO | •••••••••••• | ••••••••••★ | 22 |
| OKLAHOMA | ••••• | •••••••★ | 12 |
| OREGON | ••••••••• | •••••••••★ | 17 |
| PENNSYLVANIA | ••••••••••★ | •••••••••★ | 20 |
| RHODE ISLAND | •••• | ••••••★ | 10 |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | •••• | ••••••••••★ | 15 |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | •••• | •••••••★ | 11 |
| TENNESSEE | •••••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 18 |
| TEXAS | ••••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 23 |
| UTAH | ••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 14 |
| VERMONT | ••••••★ | •••••••★ | 13 |
| VIRGINIA | ••••••★ | ••••••••★ | 14 |
| WASHINGTON | •••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 23 |
| WEST VIRGINIA | ••••• | •••••••★ | 12 |
| WISCONSIN | •••••••••★ | ••••••••••★ | 25 |
| WYOMING | •••• | ••••••★ | 10 |
| CANADA | •• | | 2 |
| TOTAL | 47 | 130 | |

• Projects in database added prior to July 1999

★ Projects in database added since July 1999 as of July 2000

## Figure 2: States Studied in Recent Federally Funded Research Projects

| | Child Outcomes | Child Indicators | Welfare Leavers | Welfare-to-Work | Tribal Welfare-to-Work | Rural Welfare-to-Work | Employment Retention | Immigrants | Food Stamp Leavers | Transportation | Public Housing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ALABAMA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ALASKA | | ★ | | | ★ | | | | | | |
| ARIZONA | | | ★ | ★ | ★ | | | | ★ | | |
| ARKANSAS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CALIFORNIA | | ★ | ★ | | ★ | | ★ | ★ | | | ★ |
| COLORADO | | | | | | | | | | ★ | |
| CONNECTICUT | ★ | | | | | | | | | | |
| DELAWARE | | ★ | | | | | | | | | |
| DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA | | | ★ | | | | | | | | |
| FLORIDA | ★ | ★ | ★ | | | | ★ | | | | |
| GEORGIA | | ★ | ★ | | | | | | | | |
| HAWAII | | ★ | | | | | | | | | |
| IDAHO | | | | | | ★ | | | | | |
| ILLINOIS | | | ★ | | | | ★ | | ★ | ★ | |
| INDIANA | ★ | | | | | | | | | | |
| IOWA | ★ | | ★ | | | ★ | | | ★ | | |
| KANSAS | | | | | ★ | | ★ | | | | |
| KENTUCKY | | | | | | | | | | | |
| LOUISIANA | | | | | | ★ | | | | | |
| MAINE | | ★ | | | | | | | | | |
| MARYLAND | | ★ | | | | ★ | | | | ★ | |
| MASSACHUSETTS | | | ★ | ★ | | | | | | | ★ |
| MICHIGAN | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MINNESOTA | ★ | ★ | | | ★ | ★ | ★ | | | | |
| MISSISSIPPI | | | | | | ★ | | | | | |
| MISSOURI | | | ★ | | | ★ | | | | ★ | |
| MONTANA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEBRASKA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEVADA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW HAMPSHIRE | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW JERSEY | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW MEXICO | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NEW YORK | | ★ | ★ | | | ★ | | ★ | | | |
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | ★ | | | | | | |
| NORTH DAKOTA | | | | | ★ | | | | | | |
| OHIO | | | ★ | | | | | | | | |
| OKLAHOMA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OREGON | | | | | ★ | | ★ | | | | |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | ★ | | | | | | | |
| RHODE ISLAND | | ★ | | | | | | | | | |
| SOUTH CAROLINA | | | ★ | | | | ★ | | ★ | | |
| SOUTH DAKOTA | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TENNESSEE | | | | ★ | | | ★ | | | | |
| TEXAS | | | ★ | ★ | | | ★ | | | | |
| UTAH | | ★ | | | | | | | | | |
| VERMONT | | ★ | | | | ★ | | | | | |
| VIRGINIA | | | | | | | ★ | | | | |
| WASHINGTON | | | ★ | ★ | | ★ | | | | | |
| WEST VIRGINIA | | ★ | | ★ | | | | | | | |
| WISCONSIN | | | ★ | ★ | | | | | | ★ | |
| WYOMING | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Total Number of Projects** | 5 | 14 | 15 | 12-15 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 |

★ One or more research projects examining one or more sites in that state.

[1] Eight of the 12-15 in-depth study sites have been selected as of May 2000.

## Projects in the Research Forum Database and Publication Contact Information

(NOTE: Not all projects have publications available)

### REVIEWED PROJECTS

**A Better Chance (ABC) Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Alabama ASSETS Demonstration**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Arizona EMPOWER Welfare Reform Demonstration**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Assessing the New Federalism**
Contact: *The Urban Institute*
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

**Big Cities Confront the New Politics of Child and Family Policy**
Contact: *Columbia School of Social Work*
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3058

**Canada's Self-Sufficiency Project (SSP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Social Research Demonstration Corporation (SRDC)*
www.srdc.org
(613) 237-4311 or srdc@istar.ca

**Canada's Earnings Supplement Project (ESP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Social Research Demonstration Corporation (SRDC)*
www.srdc.org
(613) 237-4311 or srdc@istar.ca

**CASAWORKS for Families**
Contact: *Treatment Research Institute, Inc.*
(212) 841-5200

**Confronting the New Politics of Child and Family Policy in the U.S.**
Contact: *Columbia School of Social Work*
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3058

**Connecticut's Jobs First: Welfare Reform Evaluation Project**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Devolution, Welfare Reform, and Wellbeing Study: New York Social Indicators Survey**
Contact: *Columbia School of Social Work*
www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw
(212) 854-3358

**Examination of State Diversion Programs and Activities Under TANF**
Contact: *Center for Health Policy Research*
www.gwumc.edu/chpr
(202) 530-2368 or ihokam@gwumc.edu

**Florida Family Transition Program (FTP) Evaluation**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Fragile Families and Child Wellbeing Study**
Contact: *Fragile Families Research Team*
www.wws.princeton.edu/~crcw/projects.html
(609) 258-5894

**Front-Line Management and Practice Study**
Contact: *Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government*
www.rockinst.org
(518) 443-5258 or cooperm@rockinst.org

**GAIN Evaluation**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Growing Up in Poverty Project**
Contact: *Yale University*
www.yale.edu
(203) 432-9931

**Indiana Welfare Reform Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Infant Health and Development Program (IHDP)**
Contact: *IHDP Research Group*
(212) 678-3904

**Iowa Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Iowa's Limited Benefit Plan (LBP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**JOBS-PLUS Community Revitalization Initiative for Public Housing Families**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**LEAP Evaluation**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Minnesota's Family Investment Program (MFIP) Evaluation**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Monitoring Child and Family Social Program Outcomes: Before and After Welfare Reform in Four States**
Contact: *Chapin Hall Center for Children at the University of Chicago*
www.chapin.uchicago.edu
(773) 753-5900 or publications@chmail.spc.uchicago.edu

**Monitoring States' Welfare Reforms**
Contact: *U.S. General Accounting Office*
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov

**National Evaluation of the Comprehensive Child Development Program (CCDP)**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**National Evaluation of Welfare-to-Work Strategies** (formerly JOBS)
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**New Chance Demonstration**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**New Hope Project**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**New York Child Assistance Program (NY CAP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**NICHD Study of Early Child Care**
Contact: *National Institute of Child Health and Development*
www.nichd.nih.gov
(301) 435-6946

**North Dakota Training, Education, Employment, and Management (TEEM) Project Evaluation**
Contact: *Berkeley Planning Associates*
www.bpacal.com
(510) 465-7884 or info@bpacal.com

**Parents' Fair Share Demonstration**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Postemployment Services Demonstration**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Prenatal and Infancy Home Visitation by Nurses**
Contact: *University of Colorado*
www.colorado.edu
(303) 864-5206

**Preschool Immunization Project Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Project on Devolution and Urban Change**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**State Capacity Study**
Contact: *Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government*
www.rockinst.org
(518) 443-5258 or cooperm@rockinst.org

**State Policies and Practices Regarding Substance Abuse, Medicaid, and the Employment Needs of Welfare Recipients**
Contact: *National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University*
www.casacolumbia.org
(212) 841-5200

**State Policy Documentation Project**
Contact: *Center for Law and Social Policy*
www.clasp.org
(202) 328-5140, ext. 0

**Teenage Parent Demonstration Program**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Three States' Approaches Show Promise of Increasing Work Participation**
Contact: *U.S. General Accounting Office*
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov

**To Strengthen Michigan's Families (TSMF) Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(617) 492-7100

**Vermont Welfare Restructuring Project Evaluation**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 532-3200 or publications@mdrc.org

**Welfare Reform: States Early Experiences with Benefit Termination**
Contact: *U.S. General Accounting Office*
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-6000 or info@gao.gov

**Welfare, Children, and Families: A Three-City Study**
Contact: *Johns Hopkins University*
www.jhu.edu
(410) 516-8920 or welfare@jhu.edu

## UNREVIEWED PROJECTS

**Arizona TANF Cash Exit Study**
Contact: *Arizona Department of Economic Security*
www.state.az.us
(602) 229-2766

**Arkansas Transitional Employment Assistance (TEA) Program**
Contact: *Berkeley Planning Associates*
www.bpacal.com
(510) 465-7884 or info@bpacal.com

**Assessing Effective Welfare-to-Work Strategies for Domestic Violence Victims and Survivors in the Options/Opciones Project**
Contact: *Center for Impact Research*
(773) 342-0630 or rebekahlevin@juno.com

**Assessing the Effects of Welfare Reform on California's Most Precarious Families**
Contact: *Center for Social Services Research, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley*
cssr.berkeley.edu
(510) 642-1899 or cssr@uclink4.berkeley.edu

**Budgetary and Spending Implications of a Food Stamp Outreach Program**
Contact: *ECONorthwest for the Oregon Center for Public Policy*
www.ocpp.org
(503) 873-1201 or jlewis@ocpp.org

**California Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Center for Social Services Research, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley*
cssr.berkeley.edu
(510) 643-6556 or or cssr@uclink4.berkeley.edu

**California Works Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKS) Program Statewide Evaluation**
Contact: *RAND*
www.rand.org
(310) 393-0411 or klerman@rand.org

**California: Welfare Reform's Impact on Legal Immigrants' Access to Health Care**
Contact: *Latino Issues Forum*
www.lif.org
(415) 284-7226 or swerve@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Carolina Abecederian Project
Contact: *Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center*
www.fpg.unc.edu
(919) 966-0867 or loyd_little@unc.edu

**Child Support and Data Analysis Project**
Contact: *Center for Law and Social Policy*
www.clasp.org
(202) 328-5140 or vturet@clasp.org

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Child Welfare in a CalWORKS Environment**
Contact: *Center for Social Services Research, School of Social Welfare, University of California at Berkeley*
www.cssr.berkeley.edu
(510) 642-1899 or cssr@uclink4.berkeley.edu

**Children's Sentinel Nutrition Assessment Program (C-SNAP)**
Contact: *Children's Sentinel Nutrition Assessment Program Research Team*
www.dec2.bumc.bu.edu/csnappublic
(617) 414-3580 or anne.skalicky@bmc.org

**Colorado Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *Colorado Department of Human Services*
www.cdhs.state.co.us
(303) 866-4511 or art.trevethick@state.co.us

**Comparing Recent Declines in Oregon's Cash Assistance Caseload with Trends in the Poverty Population**
Contact: *Oregon Center for Public Policy*
www.ocpp.org
(503) 873-1201 or info@ocpp.org

**Comprehensive Evaluation of Welfare Reform in New York State**
Contact: *New York State, Office of Temporary and Disability Assistance*
www.dia.state.ny.us
(518) 474-9482

**Connecticut Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Connecticut Department of Children and Families*
www.state.ct.us/dcf
(860) 550-6528

**Contra Costa and Alameda Counties (CA) "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *SPHERE Institute*
(650) 558-3980 or gritz@sphereinstitute.org

**Converting to Wisconsin Works: Where did families go when AFDC ended in Milwaukee?**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Cuyahoga County Post-TANF Tracking Project**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 340-8849 or nandita_verma@mdrc.org

**Delaware Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Delaware's Department of Health and Social Services*
www.state.de.us/dhhs
(302) 633-2601 or dhssinfo@state.de.us

**District of Columbia "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *The Urban Institute*
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

**District of Columbia Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *District of Columbia*
www.washingtondc.gov
(202) 698-6424

**Early Head Start Research and Evaluation Project**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Evaluating CalWORKS in Los Angeles County**
Contact: *Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services*
www.dpss.co.la.ca.us

**Evaluating Welfare Reform in Illinois: A Panel Study of Recipients and Their Experiences**
Contact: *University Consortium on Welfare Reform*
www.jcpr.org/consortium.html
(708) 491-3715 or dalewis@casbah.acns.nwu.edu

**Evaluation of the North Carolina Work First Program**
Contact: *MAXIMUS*
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

**Evaluation of Washington State's Welfare Reform**
Contact: *Washington State Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee*
www.jlarcwa.gov
(360) 786-5184 or woolley_jo@leg.wa.gov

**Exiting Welfare: The Experiences of Families in Metro New Orleans**
Contact: *Southern University at New Orleans*
www.suno.edu
(504) 286-5376 or tlindhorst@aol.com

**Expanding Medicaid Enrollment Using Tax Data**
Contact: *New Mexico Human Services Department*
www.state.nm.us/hsd
(505) 823-9324 or odonnell@unm.edu

**Family Income Study**
Contact: *Washington State Institute for Public Policy, Evergreen State College*
www.wa.gov/wsipp
(360) 866-6000, ext. 6380

**Family Well-Being and Welfare Reform in Iowa**
Contact: *Iowa State University*
www.iastate.edu
(515) 294-8521 or cynthia@iastate.edu

**Federal Funding Impact Study**
Contact: *United Way of Greater St. Louis*
www.stl.unitedway.org
(314) 539-4079 or mcdaniell@stl.unitedway.org

**Finding Common Ground in the Era of Welfare Reform**
Contact: *Center for Population and Family Health, Columbia University*
www.cpmcnet.columbia.edu/dept/sph/popfam
(212) 304-5232 or drr6@columbia.edu

**Florida Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *State of Florida*
www.state.fl.us
(850) 488-9444

**Food Stamp Leavers in South Carolina**
Contact: *South Carolina Department of Social Services, Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research*
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

**Georgia Welfare Reform Impact Assessment**
Contact: *Georgia Department of Human Resources*
www.state.ga.us
(404) 651-3523 or pademf@panther.gsu.edu

**Grandparents as Primary Caregivers for TANF Children**
Contact: *Clark Atlanta University, School of Social Work*
www.cau.edu
(404) 880-6716 or mtmcdonald17@yahoo.com

**Health and Well-Being in Oklahoma: A Long-Term Analysis**
Contact: *Oklahoma Department of Human Services*
www.okdhs.org
(405) 521-4498 or kenneth.kickham@okdhs.org

**Health Effects of Welfare Reform on Children with Chronic Illness**
Contact: *Boston Medical Center, Division of General Pediatrics*
www.bmc.org
(617) 414-7911 or Lauren.Smith@bmc.org

**Heron Valley: Poverty, Parenting, and Social Change in a Small, Rural Community**
Contact: *Binghampton University*
www.binghampton.edu
(607) 589-4645 or Barbara.nikolovska@gte.net

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Homeless Family Profile Survey**
Contact: *Clark Atlanta University, School of Social Work*
www.cau.edu
(404) 880-6716 or midpass@bellsouth.net

**Illegal Aliens: Extent of Welfare Benefits Received on Behalf of U.S. Citizen Children**
Contact: *U.S. General Accounting Office*
www.gao.gov
(202) 512-7125

**Illinois Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Westat, Inc.*
www.westat.com
(301) 251-4286

**Illinois Child Welfare Waiver Project–Services to Substance-Abusing Caretakers**
Contact: *University of Illinois Children and Family Research Center*
www.uic.edu
(217) 557-2689

**Illinois' Study of Former TANF Clients**
Contact: *University of Illinois*
www.uic.edu
gjulnes@coe.usu.edu

**Immigrant Women and Welfare Project**
Contact: *Equal Rights Advocates*
www.equalright.org
(415) 621-0672 or dng@equalrights.org

**Impact of Welfare Reform on Families**
Contact: *Institute for Research on Poverty*
www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 262-6358

**Impact of Welfare Reform on Social Services Agencies in New York City**
Contact: *Hunter College School of Social Work*
(212) 866-2429

**Impact of Welfare Reform on Women Leaving TANF in Georgia**
Contact: *Georgia State University Applied Research Center*
www.cspweb.gsu.edu
(404) 651-3523 or pademf@panther.gsu.edu

**Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Implementing Welfare to Work in Michigan**
Contact: *Michigan Program on Poverty and Social Welfare at the University of Michigan*
www.ssw.umich.edu/poverty
(734) 998-8514 or kseef@umich.edu

**Implications of the Welfare Reform Law on Suburban Chicago Transit Demand**
Contact: *Urban Transportation Center, University of Illinois at Chicago*
www.uic.edu/cuppa/utc
(312) 996-4820 or vonu-pt@uic.edu

**Indiana Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Institute for Applied Research*
(317) 232-4622

**Iowa "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Kansas Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Kansas Division of Children and Family Services*
www.state.ks.us
(785) 368-8159

**Kentucky Welfare Reform Evaluation**
Contact: *University of Louisville, Kentucky*
www.louisville.edu/cbpa/usi
(502) 564-0417

**Leaving Welfare: Findings From a Survey of Former New York City Welfare Recipients**
Contact: *New York Office of Policy Program Analysis, Human Resources Division*
www.state.ny.us

**Lessons from Project Match's Longitudinal Tracking Data**
Contact: *Erikson Institute*
www.erikson.edu
(312) 755-2250 ext 2296

**Living with Welfare Reform: A Survey of Low Income Families in Illinois**
Contact: *Work, Welfare, and Families*
www.workwelfareandfamilies.org
(312) 986-4220 or wwf@workwelfareandfamilies.org

**Los Angeles County Post-TANF Tracking Project**
Contact: *MDRC*
www.mdrc.org
(212) 340-8849 or nandita_verma@mdrc.org

**Los Angeles Study of Families and Communities (LASFC)**
Contact: *RAND*
www.rand.org
(310) 393-0411 or Anne_Pebley@rand.org

**Maine Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Muskie Institute*
(202) 287-5011

**Maryland Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *University of Maryland*
www.umd.edu
(410) 706-5474

**Maryland Child Welfare Waiver Project–Managed Care and Services to Substance-Abusing Caretakers**
Contact: *University of Maryland School of Social Work*
www.umd.edu
(410) 767-7152

**Maryland Family Investment Program (FIP) Evaluation**
Contact: *Maryland Department of Human Resources*
www.dhr.state.md.us/dhr

**Maximizing Job Opportunities for Welfare Recipients Through Expansion of Value-Added Industries in Economically Disadvantaged Rural Areas**
Contact: *Louisiana State University*
www.lsu.edu
(504) 388-1731 or pmonroe@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu

**Medicaid Managed Care Study**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com

**Michigan Assemblies Project**
Contact: *Groundwork for a Just World*
(313) 822-2055

**Michigan Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Michigan Family Independence Agency*
www.mfia.mi.us
(517) 241-7521 or mehrenm@state.mi.us

**Mississippi Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Mississippi Department of Human Services*
www.state.ms.us
(601) 359-4495

**Missouri Welfare Reform Results Study**
Contact: *Missouri Department of Social Services*
www.dss.state.mo.us
(573) 751-3060 or rkoon01@mail.state.mo.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Monitoring the Impact of Welfare Reform on Immigrant Women, Infants, and Children: Access to Health Care, Health-Seeking Behaviors, and Health Outcomes**
Contact: *Bureau of Maternity Services and Family Planning, New York City Department of Health*
cityweb.ci.nyc.ny.us/html/doh
(212) 442-1744 or rthadani@dohlan.ci.nyc.ny.us

**Montana Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Montana Department of Public Health and Human Services*
www.state.mt.us
(406) 444-5906

**National Academy of Sciences Panel on Data and Methods for Measuring theEffects of Changes in Social Welfare Programs**
Contact: *National Academy of Sciences*
www.nas.edu
(202) 334-3096 or sverploe@nas.edu

**National Study of Child Care for Low-Income Families**
Contact: *National Center for Children in Poverty*
www.nccp.org
(212) 304-7100 or nccp@columbia.edu

**NCCP Child Care Research Partnership**
Contact: *National Center for Children in Poverty*
www.nccp.org
(212) 304-7100 or nccp@columbia.edu

**Nebraska Employment First Program Evaluation**
Contact: *Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services*
www.hhs.state.ne.us

**Nevada Welfare Reform Evaluation**
Contact: *Nevada State Welfare Division*
www.state.nv.us.indexw.htm
(702) 687-4770

**New Hampshire Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *New Hampshire Department of Health and Human Services*
www.state.nh.us/dhhs

**New Immigrant Survey**
Contact: *RAND*
www.rand.org
smith@rand.org

**New Mexico Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *State of New Mexico*
www.state.nm.us
(505) 827-8427

**New Mexico TANF Longitudinal Study**
Contact: *MAXIMUS*
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

**New Visions Evaluation**
Contact: *Abt Associates, Inc.*
www.abtassoc.com
(301) 913-0548

**New York "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government*
www.rockinst.org
(518) 474-9482

**New York Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *New York State Department of Social Services*
www.state.ny.us
(518) 474-9436

**North Carolina Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *North Carolina Division of Social Services*
www.state.nc.us

**Ohio Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Human Services Research Institute*
(503) 362-5682

**Oregon Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Portland University Graduate School of Social Work*
www.ssw.pdx.edu
(503) 725-8018

**Pennsylvania TANF Closed Case Telephone Survey**
Contact: *Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare*
www.dpw.state.pa.us
(717) 783-7629 or charlesk@dpw.state.pa.us

**Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology**
Contact: *Project for the Improvement of Child Support Litigation Technology*
(468) 707-3424

**Quality Child Care in Portage County and W-2**
Contact: *University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point*
www.uwsp.edu
(715) 346-4742 or oogunnai@uwsp.edu

**Retention Services in King County**
Contact: *Antioch University*
www.antiochla.edu
(206) 720-1737 or csorens@worldnet.att.net

**Rural Impacts of Welfare Reform**
Contact: *University of Wisconsin*
www.wisc.edu
(608) 263-9728 or mharvey@ssc.wisc.edu

**Rural Welfare Reform Project: Does Welfare Reform Work in Rural America?**
Contact: *Ohio University*
www.ohio.edu
(740) 593-1381 or tickamye@ohiou.edu

**Rural Welfare to Work Strategies Project: Iowa**
Contact: *Iowa State University*
www.iastate.edu
(515) 281-8629 or jbeck@dhs.state.ia.us

**San Bernardino County (CA) TANF Recipients Study**
Contact: *MAXIMUS*
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

**San Mateo County "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *SPHERE Institute*
(650) 558-3980 or gritz@sphereinstitute.org

**South Carolina Welfare and Food Stamp Leavers Study**
Contact: *MAXIMUS*
www.maxinc.com
(703) 734-2504 or prichard@maxinc.com

**South Carolina: State Welfare Reform Evaluation Program**
Contact: *South Carolina Department of Social Services, Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research*
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

**State Tax Policy and Child Poverty in New Mexico**
Contact: *New Mexico Advocates for Children and Families*
www.nmacf.org
(505) 244-9505

**Study of the Employment Patterns of Young Women and the Implications for Welfare Mothers**
Contact: *The Urban Institute*
www.urban.org
(202) 467-5775 or pubs@ui.urban.org

**Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients**
Contact: *South Carolina Department of Social Services, Office of Program Reform, Evaluation and Research*
www.state.sc.us/dss
(803) 898-7461 or medelhoch@dss.state.sc.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

**Survey of Program Dynamics**
Contact: *U.S. Census Bureau*
www.sipp.census.gov/spd
(301) 457-3246 or sshipp@census.gov

**Survey of the New Mexico Closed Case Recipients**
Contact: *Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of New Mexico*
www.unm.edu/~bber
(505) 277-6626 or dbinfo@unm.edu

**Survey of Welfare Recipients Employed or Sanctioned for Non-Compliance**
Contact: *Bureau for Business and Economic Research, University of Memphis*
www.state.tn.us/humanserv
(615) 313-5652

**Texas "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *Texas Department of Human Services*
www.dhs.state.tx.us
(512) 438-4729

**Texas Achieving Change for Texans (ACT) Welfare Reform Waiver Evaluation**
Contact: *University of Texas at Austin*
www.utexas.edu
(512) 438-3743 or r.gummerman@dhs.state.tx.us

**Texas Child Care Utilization and Outcomes Study**
Contact: *Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas*
www.utexas.edu/lbj
(512) 936-3208 or charlotte.brantley@twc.state.tx.us

**Texas Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *State of Texas*
www.state.tx.us

**Texas Families in Transition Study**
Contact: *Texas Department of Human Services*
www.dhs.state.tx.us
(512) 438-4046

**The Broken Promise: Welfare Reform Two Years Later**
Contact: *Equal Rights Advocates*
www.equalrights.org
(415) 621-0672 or dng@equalrights.org

**The Growing Crisis Among Wisconsin's Poorest Families: A Comparison of Welfare Caseload Declines and Trends in the State's Poverty Population**
Contact: *Institute for Wisconsin's Future*
www.execpc.com/~iwf
(414) 384-9094 or iwf@execpc.com

**The W-2 Job Path: An Assessment of the Employment Trajectory of W-2 Participants in Milwaukee**
Contact: *Institute for Wisconsin's Future*
www.execpc.com/~iwf
(414) 384-9094 or iwf@execpc.com

**The Welfare in Transition Project: Consequences for Women, Families, and Communities**
Contact: *Radcliffe Public Policy Institute*
www.radcliffe.edu/pubpol/index.html
(617) 496-3478 or mcdonald@radcliffe.edu

**Tracking Closed Cases Under The TANF Program in Massachusetts**
Contact: *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance*
www.state.ma.us/eohhs/eohhs.htm
(617) 348-8526 or gloria_nagle@dta.state.ma.us

**Tracking Participants and Families Affected by Welfare Reform in Florida**
Contact: *Florida State University*
www.fsu.edu
(850) 644-6284

**Understanding Families with Multiple Barriers to Self-Sufficiency**
Contact: *University of Utah Graduate School of Social Work*
www.socwk.utah.edu
(801) 585-3891 or mjtaylor@socwk.utah.edu

**Understanding the AFDC/TANF Child-Only Caseload**
Contact: *Lewin Group*
www.lewin.com
(703) 269-5721

**Washington Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Washington Children's Administration*
(360) 902-7936

**Washington State's Families After Welfare**
Contact: *Washington Department of Social and Health Services*
www.wa.gov/dshs
(360) 413-3058 or ahnj@dshs.wa.gov

**Welfare Graduates: College and Financial Independence**
Contact: *Jerome Levy Economics Institute*
(509) 623-4387 or Tkarier@ewu.edu

**Welfare Reform Commission's Longitudinal Database Study**
Contact: *Massachusetts Department of Revenue*
www.state.ma.us/dor/dorpg.htm
(617) 577-7200

**Welfare Reform, Barriers to Employment and Family Functioning**
Contact: *University of Michigan*
www.umich.edu
(313) 998-8505 or sheldond@umich.edu

**Welfare to Work: Monitoring the Impact of Welfare on American Indian Families**
Contact: *George Warren Brown School of Social Work, Washington University*
www.gwbweb.wustl.edu
(314) 935-4878 or pandeys@gwbssw.wustl.edu

**Welfare-to-Work, the Private Sector and Americorps*VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America)**
Contact: *Corporation for National Service*
www.cns.gov
(215) 597-7012 or rkeast@cns.gov

**West Virginia Child Welfare Waiver Project**
Contact: *State of West Virginia*
www.state.wv.us
(304) 558-6444

**What Happens to Families Who Leave AFDC? A Comparative Study of Wisconsin Welfare Families**
Contact: *Institute for Research on Poverty*
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 262-6358

**Wisconsin "Leavers" Project**
Contact: *Institute for Research on Poverty*
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 262-6358

**Wisconsin Works Child Support Waiver Demonstration**
Contact: *Institute for Research on Poverty*
www.wisc.edu/irp
(608) 262-6358

**Wisconsin Works Leavers Project**
Contact: *Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development*
www.dwd.state.wi.us
(608) 266-3035

**Work First New Jersey Evaluation**
Contact: *Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.*
www.mathematica-mpr.com
(609) 275-2350 or jwatterworth@mathematica-mpr.com



BEST COPY AVAILABLE